UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/029,799 | 12/31/2001 | Mark Kirkpatrick | BS01-169 | 5668 |

45695 7590 11/30/2004

WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH
P. O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| DICKESON, MATTHEW A | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2122 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/029,799 | KIRKPATRICK ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Matthew A. Dickeson | 2122 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 December 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 were presented for examination. The priority date established for examination of this application is 12/31/2001. Claims 1-14 remain pending in this application and were considered by the examiner.

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: exemplary table 200 (Pg. 8, par. 0034, l. 4), translation mapping table 300 (Pg. 9, par. 0035, l. 1). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: notification not capitalized (Pg. 9, par. 1, l. 2). Applicant is requested to review and correct all errors in the specification.

### *Claim Objections*

4. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: (a) and (b) are used to name the additional steps in the claim. Claim 1 recites a method comprising steps (a) through (f). Claim 6 recites the method of claim 1, comprising two further steps (a) and (b). This creates a duplicate step (a) and step (b), which creates inconsistency with applicant's naming structure for the steps of the claimed method. Appropriate correction is required. It is respectfully suggested that applicant rename the steps in claim 6 as (b1) and (b2) to maintain consistency in the alphabetical ordering of steps in the claimed method, or as (g) and (h) if no alphabetical ordering was intended.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1(e), at l. 8-9, recites:

"displaying a modifiable location where the notification messages are stored when generated by the computer application;"

It is unclear from the language of Claim 1(e) where the modifiable location is displayed. It is assumed during the examiner's consideration that applicant wishes for the modifiable location to be displayed in the graphical user interface.

Claim 1(f), l. 11, recites the limitation "the modifiable severity and the modified location". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Step (e)

describes the location as "modifiable", or capable of being modified; step (f) describes the location as "modified", implying that the modification has already been done.

Claims 2- 9 are also rejected for being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "severity level data in the table" in the 1st and 2nd lines of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "severity level data in the table" in the 1st and 2nd lines of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fong et al. (6,279,015).

Referring to claim 1, Fong et al. ('015) disclose a method which "provides a graphical user interface for processing information encoded in a structured information format (*source code*) to transform the information into another structured information format (*output file formatted for a system monitor*), and which allows a user to interactively define the mapping for the transformation" (See Col. 2, l.47-51, Figs. 1A-19 and related text). The method of Fong et al. ('015) comprises:

"*scanning a source file ... for one or more notification messages*" (E.g., see Col. 27, l. 2-4, which states that "in general, a parser breaks down an input source file into source components (*notification messages*) ... for map creating and editing". Locating a message or messages in the source file is necessary to establish a map between the input file and output file; the reference implies that the source components found by the parser include these messages. Fong et al. ('015) define the role of a parser as analyzing (*scanning*) and breaking down "input source documents into recognizable components to be passed to other parts of the system" (e.g. Col. 11, l. 6-8))

"*extracting the notification message from the source code file*" (E.g., see Col. 27, l. 5-8, which states "The source components ... are presented to the user for interactive selection of components of the first structure (*notification messages in source code).*" Inherent in the step of presentation is extraction of the source components from the input source file.)

"*displaying the notification message in a graphical user interface*" (E.g., see Col. 29, l. 15-19, which states that the user interface is developed using Windows GUI techniques.)

"*displaying a modifiable severity in the graphical user interface corresponding to the notification message*" (E.g., see Col. 3, l. 53-58, which states "The user interface [gives] options to the user for assigning attribute values for target components (*modifiable severity ... corresponding to the notification message*). Exemplary options are ... values input interactively by the user using the user interface.")

"*displaying a modifiable location where the notification messages are stored...*" (See Fig. 11 and related text, e.g. Col. 16 l. 18-27, which describes a dialog allowing the user to choose a file type, file name, and directory in which to save the file.)

"*generating an export file in a format compatible with a system monitor ... comprising the modifiable severity and the modified location*" (E.g., see Col. 4, l. 4-10, which states "The invention accepts user input for selecting an input source file for transformation to a target output file ... and the requested input file and map (*modifiable severity*) are then processed to transform the input file into the requested output file format (*format compatible with a system monitor).* The created output file is then sent to the user specified destination (*modified location*).")

As to claim 2, Fong et al. ('015) disclose a step for assigning a null value (*default value*) to an attribute (*modifiable severity*) when no source is selected for mapping that attribute (see Figs. 18a-c and related text, and Col. 36, l. 27-30). Assigning a null value to an attribute when there is no user instruction to assign another value to that attribute can be reasonably read as assigning a default value to that attribute, which reads on the limitations of applicant's claim 2.

Referring to claim 4, Fong et al. ('015) describes options in the user interface which allow the user to assign attribute values input interactively (*modifying the modifiable severity*) to the target components (e.g., see Col. 3, l. 53-58). It is inherent that the transformed output file will comprise these modified attribute values; thus, the reference teaches the limitations of applicant's claim 4.

As per claim 5, Fong et al. ('015) show and describe a system for the user to specify an output file destination (*modifying the modifiable location*), including file directory, file type, and filename (see Fig. 11 and related text, e.g. Col. 16 l. 18-27); the output file must comprise this user-modified location. These teachings read on the limitations of applicant's claim 5.

With respect to claim 10, Fong et al. ('015) illustrate a class diagram showing a system for reading, mapping, and transforming an input file to a specified output file format (see Figs. 11-18a-c and related text). The system comprises:

"*a source file corresponding to a computer application to be monitored*" (E.g., see Col. 17, l. 41-43, which describes a representation of an input document after parsing.)

"*an import module to extract notification messages from the source file and store the notification messages in a scan file*" (E.g., see col. 19, l. 36-47, which describes the creation of a SymbolTable (*scan file*), the system representation of the input document (*source file*) opened by the FileService, the SymbolTable being generated by the ParserService (*extract notification messages...and store*) and returned to the system for further processing.)

"*a manager module to display each of the notification messages ... in a table in a scrollable window in a graphical user interface*" (E.g., see Figs. 12b-c and related text, which show and describe a GUI window with a ListBox (a one-column table) showing the SGML tags (*notification messages*) to be mapped; an inherent property of a ListBox is to be scrollable when the list size exceeds the size of the ListBox display window.)

"*an export module to store data in the table in a format ...*" (see Figs. 11, 12b-c, and 13 and related text, and Col. 4 l. 4-10, which states "The invention accepts user input for selecting an input source file for transformation to a target output file ... and the requested input file and map (*data in the table*) are then processed to transform the input file into the requested output file format (*format acceptable to the system monitor*). The created output file is then sent to the user specified destination.")

In regard to claim 11, Fong et al. ('015) show and describe GUI means for the user to modify the data in the table (see Figs. 12b and 18a-c and related text, e.g. Col. 25, l. 50-54, l. 61-66, and Col. 26, l. 19-27) until the user has made all desired modifications. This teaches the limitation of applicant's claim 11.

Referring to claim 12, Fong et al. ('015) show and describe a means for the user to specify an output file destination, including file directory, file type, and filename (see Fig. 11 and related text, e.g. Col. 16 l. 18-27). The reference also teaches that "the requested input file and map (*data in the table*) are then processed to transform the input file into the requested output file format (*format acceptable to the system monitor*)." (see Col. 4 l. 4-10). Since the user requested output file format can include a format acceptable to a system monitor, and because the data is transformed (*converted*) into the requested output file format, this can be reasonably read to anticipate applicant's claim 12.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong et al. ('015) as applied to Claim 1 above, and in view of well known limitations.

Fong et al. ('015) describe the display of SGML tags (*notification messages*) and HTML attributes (*modifiable severity*) in a GUI dialog (see Figs. 12b-c and 18a-c and related text), and the use of a GUI Save dialog to define the file type, path, and filename (*modifiable location*) of the output file (see Fig. 11 and related text).

Fong et al. ('015) does not teach the use of a single table to display all three of these items together in a single window.

It would have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant that the data of Fong et al. ('015) pertinent to applicant's invention (notification message, modifiable severity, modifiable location) could have been easily displayed together in one of many different GUI forms, including a table. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the display means set forth in Fong et al. ('015) to display the pertinent data together in one table to facilitate a simple and concise interface for the user, and to reduce processing and display overhead by reducing the number of windows spawned to display the pertinent data to the user.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong et al. ('015) in view of Trainer (5,432,942).

Fong et al. ('015) describe a method for scanning a source file for structural components (*notification messages*) and presenting them to the user (*extracting notification messages from the source file*) for interactive selection (see Col. 27, l. 2-8).

Fong et al. ('015) does not teach the intermediate step of "storing the (notification messages to be presented to the user) in a data file", nor does the reference teach the step of "extracting (the notification messages) from the data file for display ...".

Trainer ('942) describes a method of "inputting a computer program (*source file*) to be analyzed, extracting and converting information about at least one data structure from the program (*extracting notification messages from the source file*) and storing the

information in at least one random access file (*storing the notification messages in a data file*). The method further comprises displaying the information stored in said ... random access file (*extracting the notification messages from the data file for display*) in a desired format (*in the graphical user interface*) (e.g., see Col. 3, l. 45-50). This reads on the limitation of applicant's claim 6.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the method of Fong et al. ('015) by adding the intermediate step in the teachings of Trainer ('942) of storing the structural components extracted from the source file in a data file for later extraction and display to the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the method set forth in Fong et al. ('015) to store the extracted information in a file for later use so as to save processing time by eliminating the need to scan a single unmodified source file multiple times.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong et al. ('015) and Trainer ('942) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Greenfeld (4,931,928).

Although Trainer ('942) teaches the step of storing extracted structural data information in a random access file (*data file*) for later extraction and display to the user, the reference does not teach the step of removing duplicated information from the random access file.

Greenfeld ('928) describes an apparatus for analyzing source code, in which he states that "In analyzing a source file, the analysis subsystem must first remove from

the database any information extracted previously from this source file (*removing duplicate notification messages from the data file*) ... This prior removal is necessary for the reliability of the data in the database" (see Col. 7, l. 39-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention by applicant to further modify the method of Fong et al. ('015), introducing the intermediate step of Trainer ('942) for storing extracted information in a file for later use, and further introducing the step of removing duplicate information from that file using the teachings and motivation set forth in Greenfeld ('928).

13. Claims 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fong et al. ('015) in view of Warman et al. (5,657,221).

Fong et al. ('015) shows a system wherein the user modifies attributes (*modifiable severity*) associated with target source components (*notification messages*) of a source file, and wherein an output file is generated in a requested format (*format compatible with a system monitor*), and sent to the user-specified destination (see Figs. 11, 12b-c, and 18a-c and related text, and Col. 3 l. 15-21, l. 53-58, and Col. 4 l. 4-10).

Fong et al. ('015) does not teach the step of translating the user-modified attributes from numerical to textual form, or from textual to numerical form.

In an analogous art, Warman et al. ('221) describe a method of representing non-computer devices using a graphical representation on a computer display. The reference describes user manipulation of the graphically represented controls of the non-computer devices, such that the value represented by a control and displayed to the user may be transformed, including "converting a numerical value to a textual value"

(see Figs. 4 and 9a and related text, e.g. Col. 4, l. 6-9, and Col. 16, l. 40-43). The reference teaches converting a numerical value to a textual value as an example, and therefore implies that a conversion from a textual value to a numerical value is also possible for a given control object. It is inherent that the conversion of the represented data from one form to another would be done to display the converted value to the user as appropriate.

It would have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the method of Fong et al. ('015) to include the data manipulation step described in Warman et al. ('221) to change the user-modified attributes (*severity level*) from numerical to textual or textual to numerical for display purposes. It would also have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to carry this modification through such that the generation of the output file described by Fong et al. ('015) would reflect the converted attributes for desired use or display of the contents of the output file. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the method set forth in Fong et al. ('015) using the teachings of Warman et al. ('221) to suit the mode of the user-modified attributes (textual or numerical) to the needs of the application making use of those attributes.

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pickett et al. (5,062,147), Scarola et al. (5,353,315), Iliff (5,660,176 and 6,748,353), Mueller (5,673,390 and 6,115,544), Motoyama et al. (6,009,436), Mathieu et al. (6,009,441), Charisius et al. (2002/0023257), Sherlock et al.

(2002/0093527), and Cooper et al. (2003/0061506, 2004/0015579, and 2004/0039942) further show the state of this art.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew A. Dickeson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7219. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAD

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER